

STANLEY–REISNER RINGS WITH LARGE MULTIPLICITIES ARE COHEN–MACAULAY

NAOKI TERAJ AND KEN-ICHI YOSHIDA

ABSTRACT. We prove that certain class of Stanley–Reisner rings having sufficiently large multiplicities are Cohen–Macaulay using Alexander duality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, let $S = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a homogeneous polynomial ring over a field k with $\deg X_i = 1$. For a simplicial complex Δ on vertex set $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ (note that $\{i\} \in \Delta$ for all i), $k[\Delta] = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/I_\Delta$ is called the *Stanley–Reisner ring* of Δ , where I_Δ is an ideal generated by all square-free monomials $X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_p}$ such that $\{i_1, \dots, i_p\} \notin \Delta$. The ring $A = k[\Delta]$ is a homogeneous reduced ring with the unique homogeneous maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)k[\Delta]$ and the Krull dimension $d = \dim \Delta + 1$. Let $e(A)$ denote the *multiplicity* $e_0(\mathfrak{m}A_{\mathfrak{m}}, A_{\mathfrak{m}})$ of A , which is equal to the number of facets (i.e., maximal faces) F of Δ with $\dim F = d - 1$. Also, we frequently call it the multiplicity of Δ . Note that Δ is called *pure* if all facets of Δ have the same dimension. See [1, 9] for more details.

Take a graded minimal free resolution of a homogeneous k -algebra $A = S/I$ over S :

$$0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} S(-j)^{\beta_{p,j}(A)} \xrightarrow{\varphi_p} \cdots \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}(A)} \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} S \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0.$$

Then the *initial degree* $\text{indeg } A$ (resp. *the relation type* $\text{rt}(A)$) of A is defined by $\text{indeg } A = \min\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{1,j}(A) \neq 0\}$ (resp. $\text{rt}(A) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{1,j}(A) \neq 0\}$). Also, $\text{reg } A = \max\{j - i \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{i,j}(A) \neq 0\}$ is called the *Castelnuovo–Mumford regularity* of A . It is easy to see that $\text{reg } A \geq \text{indeg } A - 1$, and A has *linear resolution* if equality holds.

The main purpose of this paper is to prove the following theorems:

Theorem 2.1. Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Put $\text{codim } A = c$. If $e(A) \geq \binom{n}{c} - c$, then A is Cohen–Macaulay.

Theorem 3.1. Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Put $\text{codim } A = c$. Suppose that Δ is pure (i.e., A is equidimensional). If $e(A) \geq \binom{n}{c} - 2c + 1$, then A is Cohen–Macaulay.

Date: Mar.10, 2005.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 13F55, ; Secondary 13H10.

Key words and phrases. Stanley–Reisner ring, Cohen–Macaulay, Alexander duality, multiplicity, linear resolution, initial degree, relation type.

It is easy to prove the above theorems in the case of $d = 2$. When $d = 2$, A is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if Δ is connected. In fact, a disconnected graph has at most $\binom{n-1}{2} (= \binom{n}{2} - (n-2) - 1)$ edges. This shows that Theorem 2.1 is true in this case. Similarly, a disconnected graph without an isolated point has at most $\binom{n-2}{2} + 1 (= \binom{n}{2} - 2(n-2))$ edges. Indeed, such a graph is contained in a disjoint union of an $(n-i)$ -complete graph and an i -complete graph for some $2 \leq i \leq n-2$. When $i = 2$, the number of edges of the above union is just $\binom{n-2}{2} + 1$. Thus we also get Theorem 3.1 in this case.

The case $\text{indeg } A = d$ and $c \geq 2$ is essential in the above two theorems. In order to prove Theorems 2.1 and 3.1 in this case, we consider their Alexander dual versions:

Theorem 2.7. Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Suppose that $\text{indeg } A = d$. If $e(A) \leq d$, then A has d -linear resolution. In particular, $\text{rt}(A) = d$.

Theorem 3.3. Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Suppose that $\text{indeg } A = \text{rt}(A) = d$. If $e(A) \leq 2d-1$, then A has d -linear resolution. In particular, $a(A) < 0$.

For a Stanley–Reisner ring A with $\text{indeg } A = \dim A = d$, it has d -linear resolution if and only if $a(R) < 0$. Thus the assertion of Theorem 3.3 could be seen as an analogy of the following: Let R be a homogeneous integral domain over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0. If $e(R) \leq 2 \dim R - 1$ and $\text{codim } R \geq 2$, then $a(R) < 0$.

In the last section, we will provide several examples related to the above results.

2. COMPLEXES Δ WITH $e(k[\Delta]) \geq \binom{n}{c} - c$

In this section, we use the following notation. Let Δ be a simplicial complex on $V = [n]$, and let $A = k[\Delta] = S/I_\Delta$ be the Stanley–Reisner ring of Δ . Put $d = \dim A$, and $c = \text{codim } A = n - d$. Note that $\binom{[n]}{d}$ denotes the family of all d -subsets of $[n]$.

The main purpose of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. If $e(A) \geq \binom{n}{c} - c$, then A is Cohen–Macaulay.

Let us begin the proof of this theorem with the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. If $e(A) \geq \binom{n}{c} - c$, then $\text{indeg } A \geq d$.

Proof. Suppose that $\text{indeg } A < d$. Take a squarefree monomial $M \in I_\Delta$ with $\deg M = d-1$. Then $(n-d+1)$ distinct squarefree monomials appear among $X_1M, \dots, X_nM$; say $M_1, \dots, M_{c+1}$. Let $F_i \in \binom{[n]}{d}$ corresponding to M_i , respectively. Then since no F_i is contained in Δ we have

$$e(A) \leq \binom{n}{d} - (c+1).$$

This contradicts the assumption. □

Lemma 2.3. *Under the above notation, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\text{indeg } A = d + 1$.
- (2) $e(A) = \binom{n}{d}$.
- (3) $I_\Delta = (X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_{d+1}} : 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_{d+1} \leq n)$.
- (4) A has $(d + 1)$ -linear resolution.

When this is the case, A is Cohen–Macaulay with $\text{rt}(A) = d + 1$.

Proof. See, e.g., [11, Proposition 1.2]. □

Therefore we may assume that $\text{indeg } A = d$ to prove Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose $n = d + 1$. If $e(A) \geq d$, then A is a hypersurface.*

Proof. Suppose that A is not a hypersurface. Then we can write

$$I_\Delta = X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_p} J$$

for some monomial ideal $J (\neq R)$ with $\text{height } J \geq 2$ since $\text{height } I_\Delta = 1$. In particular, A is not Cohen–Macaulay. Thus $\text{indeg } A \leq d$ by Lemma 2.3. Then $e(A) = p \leq d - 1$. This contradicts the assumption. □

Thus we may also assume that $c = \text{codim } A \geq 2$. then let Δ^* be the Alexander dual of Δ :

$$\Delta^* = \{F \in 2^V : V \setminus F \notin \Delta\}.$$

Then Δ^* is a simplicial complex on the same vertex set V of Δ for which the following properties are satisfied:

Proposition 2.5. *Under the above notation, we have*

- (1) $\text{indeg } k[\Delta^*] + \dim k[\Delta] = n$.
- (2) $\text{rt}(k[\Delta^*]) = \text{bight } I_\Delta$, where

$$\text{bight } I = \max\{\text{height } \mathfrak{p} : \mathfrak{p} \text{ is a minimal prime divisor of } I\}.$$

In particular, Δ is pure if and only if $\text{rt}(k[\Delta^]) = \text{indeg } k[\Delta^*]$.*

- (3) $\beta_{0,q^*}(I_{\Delta^*}) = e(k[\Delta])$, where $q^* = \text{indeg } k[\Delta^*]$.
- (4) $(\Delta^*)^* = \Delta$.

Also, the following theorem is fundamental. See [3] for more details.

Theorem 2.6 (Eagon–Reiner [3]). *$k[\Delta]$ is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if $k[\Delta^*]$ has linear resolution.*

We want to reduce Theorem 2.1 to its Alexander dual version. Let Δ^* be the Alexander dual of Δ . Then $\text{indeg } k[\Delta^*] = n - \dim k[\Delta] = c$ and $\dim k[\Delta^*] = n - \text{indeg } k[\Delta] = n - d = c$. Also, since $\text{indeg } k[\Delta^*] = \dim k[\Delta] = c$, we have

$$e(k[\Delta^*]) = \binom{n}{c} - \beta_{0,c}(I_{\Delta^*}) = \binom{n}{c} - e(A) \leq c$$

Therefore, it is enough to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.7 (Alexander dual version of Theorem 2.1). *Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Suppose that $\text{indeg } A = d$. If $e(A) \leq d$, then A has d -linear resolution. In particular, $\text{rt}(A) = d$.*

Proof. (1) Put $a(A) = \sup\{p \in \mathbb{Z} : [H_m^d(A)]_p \neq 0\}$, the a -invariant of A . From the assumption we obtain that

$$a(A) + d \leq e(A) - 1 \leq d - 1,$$

where the first inequality follows from e.g. [6, Lemma 3.1]. Hence $a(A) < 0$. On the other hand, we have that $[H_m^i(A)]_j = 0$ for all i and $j \geq 1$ since A is a Stanley–Reisner ring. Then

$$\operatorname{reg} A = \inf\{p \in \mathbb{Z} : [H_m^i(A)]_j = 0 \text{ for all } i + j > p\} \leq d - 1 = \operatorname{indeg} A - 1.$$

This means that A has d -linear resolution, as required. $\square$

Now let us discuss a generalization of Theorem 2.7. Let $A = S/I$ be an arbitrary homogeneous reduced k -algebra over a field k of characteristic $p > 0$. The ring A is called F -pure if the Frobenius map $F: A \rightarrow A$ ($a \mapsto a^p$) is pure. It is known that a Stanley–Reisner ring is F -pure, and that if A is F -pure then $[H_m^i(A)]_j = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$. Thus the proof of Theorem 2.7 involves that of the following proposition.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $A = S/I$ be a homogeneous F -pure k -algebra. Put $\dim A = \operatorname{indeg} A = d \geq 2$. If $e(A) \leq d$, then A has d -linear resolution. In particular, $\operatorname{rt}(A) = d$ and $a(A) < 0$.*

3. COMPLEXES Δ WITH $e(k[\Delta]) \geq \binom{n}{c} - 2c + 1$

We use the same notation as in the previous section. For a face G in Δ and $v \in V$, we put

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{V \setminus \{v\}} &= \{F \in \Delta : v \notin F\}, \\ \operatorname{star}_\Delta G &= \{F \in \Delta : F \cup G \in \Delta\}, \\ \operatorname{link}_\Delta G &= \{F \in \Delta : F \cup G \in \Delta, F \cap G = \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

The main purpose of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Put $c = \operatorname{codim} A$. Suppose that Δ is pure. If $e(A) \geq \binom{n}{c} - 2c + 1$, then A is Cohen–Macaulay.*

Now suppose that $c = 1$ (resp. $\operatorname{indeg} A \geq d + 1$). Then the assertion follows from Lemma 2.4 (resp. Lemma 2.3). Thus we may assume that $c \geq 2$ and $q = \operatorname{indeg} A \leq d$. The following lemma corresponds to Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 3.2. *If $e(k[\Delta]) \geq \binom{n}{c} - 2c + 1$, then $\operatorname{indeg} k[\Delta] \geq d - 1$, i.e., (1) $\operatorname{indeg} k[\Delta] = d$ or (2) $\operatorname{indeg} k[\Delta] = d - 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\operatorname{indeg} k[\Delta] < d - 1$. Take a squarefree monomial $M \in I_\Delta$ with $\deg M = d - 2$. Then there are $\binom{n-d+2}{2}$ squarefree monomials in degree d in I_Δ . Note $\binom{n-d+2}{2} = \binom{c+2}{2} \geq 2c$. Hence

$$e(k[\Delta]) \leq \binom{n}{c} - 2c.$$

This contradicts the assumption. $\square$

First, we consider the Alexander dual version of Theorem 3.1 in the case of $\operatorname{indeg} k[\Delta] = d$. Namely, we will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3 (Alexander dual version of Theorem 3.1, Case (1)). *Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Suppose that $\text{indeg } A = \text{rt}(A) = d$. If $e(A) \leq 2d - 1$, then A has d -linear resolution. In particular, $a(A) < 0$.*

The proof of the above theorem can be reduced to that of the following theorem, which is a key result in this paper.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Suppose that $\text{rt}(A) \leq d$. If $e(A) \leq 2d - 1$, then $\text{reg } A \leq d - 1$, equivalently, $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) = 0$.*

Proof. Put $e = e(A)$. Let Δ' be the subcomplex that is spanned by all facets of dimension $d - 1$. Replacing Δ with Δ' , we may assume that Δ is pure.

We use induction on $d = \dim A \geq 2$. First suppose $d = 2$. The assumption shows that Δ does not contain the boundary complex of a triangle. Hence $\tilde{H}_1(\Delta) = 0$ since $e(A) \leq 3$.

Next suppose that $d \geq 3$, and that the assertion holds for any complex the dimension of which is less than $d - 1$. Assume that $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) \neq 0$. Take one Δ whose multiplicity is minimal among the multiplicities of those complexes. Then Δ does not contain any *free face* (see [7]). That is, every face that is not a facet is contained in at least two facets. Indeed, suppose that Δ contains a free face (say, G) and put $\Delta' = \Delta \setminus \{F \in \Delta : F \supseteq G\}$. Then since G is a free face of Δ , Δ' is homotopy equivalent to Δ and $e(k[\Delta']) = e(k[\Delta]) - 1$. In particular, $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta') \cong \tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) \neq 0$. This contradicts the minimality of $e(k[\Delta])$.

First consider the case of $\text{rt}(A) = d$. Take a generator $X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_d}$ of I_Δ . For every $j = 1, \dots, d$, each $G_j = \{i_1, \dots, \hat{i}_j, \dots, i_d\}$ is contained in at least two facets as mentioned above. Then $e(A) \geq 2d$ since those facets are different from each other. This is a contradiction.

Next we consider the case of $\text{rt}(A) < d$. Take a Mayer–Vietoris sequence with respect to $\Delta = \Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}} \cup \text{star}_\Delta \{n\}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}) \oplus \tilde{H}_{d-1}(\text{star}_\Delta \{n\}) \longrightarrow \tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) \longrightarrow \tilde{H}_{d-2}(\text{link}_\Delta \{n\}).$$

The minimality of $e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}])$ yields that $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}) = 0$ since $e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}]) < e(k[\Delta])$. On the other hand, it is known that $\tilde{H}_i(\text{star}_\Delta \{n\}) = 0$ for all i . Hence $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) \hookrightarrow \tilde{H}_{d-2}(\text{link}_\Delta \{n\})$. In particular, $\tilde{H}_{d-2}(\text{link}_\Delta \{n\}) \neq 0$.

Set $\Delta' = \text{link}_\Delta \{n\}$. Then Δ' is a complex on $V \setminus \{n\}$ such that $\dim k[\Delta'] = d - 1$ and $\text{rt}(k[\Delta']) \leq \text{rt}(k[\Delta]) \leq d - 1$. In order to apply the induction hypothesis to Δ' , we want to see that $e(k[\Delta']) \leq 2d - 3$. In order to do that, we consider $e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}])$. As $\Delta \neq \text{star}_\Delta \{n\}$, one can take $F = \{i_1, \dots, i_p, n\} \notin \Delta$ for some $p \leq d - 2$ such that $X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_p} X_n$ is a generator of I_Δ . Then $G := \{i_1, \dots, i_p\} \in \Delta$, but it is not a facet of Δ . Thus it is contained in at least two facets of Δ , each of which does not contain n . Hence $e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}]) \geq 2$. Thus we get

$$e(k[\Delta']) = e(k[\text{star}_\Delta \{n\}]) = e(k[\Delta]) - e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}]) \leq 2d - 3.$$

By induction hypothesis, we have $\tilde{H}_{d-2}(\text{link}_\Delta \{n\}) = 0$. This is a contradiction. $\square$

Next, we consider the Alexander dual version of Theorem 3.1 in the case of $\text{indeg } k[\Delta] = d - 1$. Namely, we must prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5 (Alexander dual version of Theorem 3.1, Case (2)). *Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley-Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 2$. Suppose that $\text{indeg } A = \text{rt}(A) = d - 1$. If $\mu(I_\Delta) \geq \binom{n}{d-1} - 2d + 3$, then A has $(d-1)$ -linear resolution with $e(A) = 1$.*

Proof. First we show that $e(A) = 1$. Now suppose that $e(A) \geq 2$. Then there exist at least two facets F_1 and F_2 with $\#(F_1) = \#(F_2) = d$. This implies that $f_{d-2}(\Delta) \geq 2d - 1$. However, by the assumption, we have

$$f_{d-2}(\Delta) = \binom{n}{d-1} - \beta_{0,d-1}(I_\Delta) = \binom{n}{d-1} - \mu(I_\Delta) \leq 2d - 3.$$

This is a contradiction. Hence we get $e(A) = 1$.

In order to prove that A has $(d-1)$ -linear resolution, it is enough to show that $\beta_{i,j}(A) = 0$ for all $i \geq c$ and $j \geq i + d - 1$ by [8, Theorem 5.2]. Also, it suffices to show that $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) = \tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta) = \tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta_W) = 0$ for all subsets $W \subset V$ with $\#(W) = n - 1$ by virtue of Hochster's formula on the Betti numbers:

$$\beta_{i,j}(A) = \sum_{\substack{W \subset V \\ \#(W)=j}} \dim_k \tilde{H}_{j-i-1}(\Delta_W; k).$$

Claim 1. $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) = \tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta) = 0$.

Since $\text{rt}(A) \leq d - 1 \leq d$ and $e(A) = 1 \leq 2d - 1$, we have $\tilde{H}_{d-1}(\Delta) = 0$ by Theorem 3.4. Now let $F = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ be the unique facet with $\#(F) = d$. Consider a simplicial subcomplex $\Delta' := \Delta \setminus \{F, G\}$ where $G = \{1, 2, \dots, d-1\}$. Then $\dim k[\Delta'] = d - 1$ and $e(k[\Delta']) \leq 2d - 4 \leq 2(d-1) - 1$. Also, since $\text{rt}(k[\Delta']) \leq \text{rt}(k[\Delta]) \leq d - 1$, applying Theorem 3.4 to Δ' , we obtain that $\tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta) \cong \tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta') = 0$, as required.

Claim 2. $\tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta_W) = 0$ for all subsets $W \subset V$ with $\#(W) = n - 1$.

Let W be a subset of V such that $\#(W) = n - 1$. Put $\{a\} = V \setminus W$. If a is not contained in F , then $\tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta_W) = 0$ by the similar argument as in the proof of the previous claim. So we may assume that $a \in F$. Then $\dim k[\Delta_W] = d - 1$ and $e(k[\Delta_W]) \leq (d - 3) + 1 = d - 2 \leq 2(d - 1) - 1$. Also, since $\text{rt}(k[\Delta_W]) \leq d - 1$, we have $\tilde{H}_{d-2}(\Delta_W) = 0$ by Theorem 3.4 again.

Hence $k[\Delta]$ has $(d-1)$ -linear resolution, as required. $\square$

Example 3.6. Let ρ, d be integers with $0 \leq \rho \leq d - 3$. Let Δ be a simplicial complex on $V = [n]$ spanned by $F = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, any distinct ρ elements from $\binom{[n]}{d-1} \setminus \binom{[d]}{d-1}$ and all elements of $\binom{[n]}{d-2}$. Then $\dim k[\Delta] = d$, $\text{indeg } k[\Delta] = \text{rt}(k[\Delta]) = d - 1$. Also, we have

$$\mu(I_\Delta) = \beta_{0,d-1}(I_\Delta) = \binom{n}{d-1} - \rho - d \geq \binom{n}{d-1} - 2d + 3.$$

Hence Δ satisfies the assumption of the above proposition.

On the other hand, we have no results for F-pure k -algebras corresponding to Theorem 3.3. But we remark the following.

Remark 3.7. As mentioned in the introduction, if A is a homogeneous integral domain over an algebraically closed field of $\text{char } k = 0$ with $\text{codim } A \geq 2$ and $e(A) \leq 2d - 1$ then one has $a(A) < 0$. In fact, it is known that an inequality

$$a(A) + d \leq \left\lceil \frac{e(A) - 1}{\text{codim } A} \right\rceil$$

holds; see e.g., the remark after Theorem 3.2 in [6]. Moreover, Professor Chikashi Miyazaki told us that this inequality is also true in positive characteristic.

Question 3.8. Let $A = k[A_1]$ be a homogeneous F -pure, equidimensional k -algebra. Put $\dim A = \text{indeg } A = d \geq 2$. If $e(A) \leq 2d - 1$, then does $a(A) < 0$ hold?

4. BUCHSBAUMNESS

A Stanley–Reisner ring $A = k[\Delta]$ is *Buchsbaum* if and only if Δ is pure and $k[\text{link}_\Delta \{i\}]$ is Cohen–Macaulay for every $i \in [n]$. As an application of Theorem 3.1, we can provide sufficient conditions for $k[\Delta]$ to be Buchsbaum.

Proposition 4.1. Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a Stanley–Reisner ring of Krull dimension $d \geq 3$. Suppose that Δ is pure, $\text{indeg } A = d$ and $e(A) \geq \binom{n}{c} - 2c$. Then

- (1) $e(k[\text{link}_\Delta \{i\}]) \geq \binom{n-1}{c} - 2c$ for all i .
- (2) If $\text{height } [I_\Delta]_d S \geq 2$, then A is Buchsbaum.
- (3) If $\text{rt}(A) = d$, then A is Buchsbaum.

Proof. We may assume that $c \geq 2$, $e(A) = \binom{n}{c} - 2c$, and that $\Delta \neq \text{star}_\Delta \{i\}$ for every $i \in [n]$. Put $\Gamma_i = \text{link}_\Delta \{i\}$ for each $i \in [n]$.

(1) We first show the following claim.

Claim: $e(A) \leq \binom{n}{d} - \left\{ \binom{n-1}{d-1} - e(k[\Gamma_i]) \right\}$ for every $i \in [n]$. Also, equality holds if and only if $i \in F$ holds for all $F \in \binom{[n]}{d} \setminus \Delta$.

Put $W_i = \left\{ F \in \binom{[n]}{d} : i \in F \notin \text{star}_\Delta \{i\} \right\}$. Then $\#(W_i) \leq \#(\bigcup_{i=1}^n W_i)$ implies that

$$\binom{n-1}{d-1} - e(k[\Gamma_j]) \leq \binom{n}{d} - e(A),$$

as required. Also, equality holds if and only if $W_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^n W_i$, that is, $i \in F$ holds for all $F \in \binom{[n]}{d} \setminus \Delta$.

Now suppose that $e(k[\Gamma_i]) \leq \binom{n-1}{d-1} - 2c - 1$ for some $i \in [n]$. Then the claim implies that $e(A) \leq \binom{n}{d} - 2c - 1$, which contradicts the assumption. Thus we get (1).

(2) Suppose that $\text{height } [I_\Delta]_d S \geq 2$. Then there is no element $i \in [n]$ for which $i \in F$ holds for all $F \in \binom{[n]}{d} \setminus \Delta$. Thus the claim yields that

$$\binom{n}{d} - 2c = e(A) \leq \binom{n}{d} - \left[\binom{n-1}{d-1} - e(k[\Gamma_i]) \right] - 1,$$

that is, $e(k[\Gamma_i]) \geq \binom{n-1}{d-1} - 2c + 1$ for every $i \in [n]$. Also, we note that Γ_i is pure and $\text{indeg } k[\Gamma_i] = \dim k[\Gamma_i] = d - 1$. Applying Theorem 3.1 to $k[\Gamma_i]$, we obtain that $k[\Gamma_i]$ is Cohen–Macaulay. Therefore A is Buchsbaum since Δ is pure.

(3) Now suppose that A is *not* Buchsbaum. Then since $\text{height}[I_\Delta]_d S = 1$, one can take $i \in [n]$ for which $i \in F$ holds for all $F \in \binom{[n]}{d} \setminus \Delta$. We may assume $i = n$. Then $\{1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, d+1\} \in \Delta$ for all $i \in [d+1]$ because $n-1 \geq d+1$. This means that $X_1 \cdots X_{d+1}$ is a generator of I_Δ ; thus $\text{rt}(A) = d+1$. $\square$

5. EXAMPLES

Throughout this section, let c, d be given integers with $c, d \geq 2$. Set $n = c + d$.

Example 5.1. Put $F_{i,j} = \{1, 2, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, d, j\}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, d; j = d+1, \dots, n$. For a given integer e with $1 \leq e \leq cd$, we choose e faces (say, $F_1, \dots, F_e$) from $\{F_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq d, d+1 \leq j \leq n\}$, which is a simplicial join of $2^{[d]} \setminus \{[d]\}$ and c points.

Let Δ be a simplicial complex spanned by $F_1, \dots, F_e$ and all elements of $\binom{[n]}{d-1}$. Then $k[\Delta]$ is a d -dimensional Stanley–Reisner ring with $\text{indeg } k[\Delta] = \text{rt}(k[\Delta]) = d$ and $e(k[\Delta]) = e$.

In particular, when $e \leq 2d-1$, $k[\Delta]$ has d -linear resolution by Theorem 3.3. Thus Also, the Alexander dual complexes of them provide examples satisfying hypothesis of Theorem 3.1.

The following example shows that the assumption “ $e(A) \leq 2d-1$ ” is optimal in Theorem 3.3.

Example 5.2. There exists a complex Δ on $V = [n]$ ($n = d+2$) for which $k[\Delta]$ does not have d -linear resolution with $\dim k[\Delta] = \text{indeg } k[\Delta] = \text{rt}(k[\Delta]) = d$ and $e(k[\Delta]) = 2d$.

In fact, put $n = d+2$. Let Δ_0 be a complex on $V = [n]$ such that $k[\Delta_0]$ is a complete intersection defined by $(X_1 \cdots X_d, X_{d+1} X_{d+2})$. Also, let Δ be a complex on V that is spanned by all facets of Δ_0 and all elements of $\binom{[n]}{d-1}$:

$$I_\Delta = (X_1 \cdots X_d)S + (X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_{d-2}} X_{d+1} X_{d+2} : 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_{d-2} \leq d)S.$$

Then $\widetilde{H}_{d-1}(k[\Delta]) \cong \widetilde{H}_{d-1}(k[\Delta_0]) \neq 0$ since $a(k[\Delta_0]) = 0$. Hence $k[\Delta]$ does not have linear resolution.

Remark 5.3. The above example is obtained by considering the case $c = 2, e = 2d$ in Example 5.1.

The next example shows that the assumption “ $\text{rt}(A) = d$ ” is *not* superfluous in Theorem 3.3.

Example 5.4. Suppose that $d+1 \leq e \leq \binom{n}{d} - 1$. There exists a simplicial complex Δ on $V = [n]$ such that $\dim k[\Delta] = \text{indeg } k[\Delta] = d$, $\text{rt}(k[\Delta]) = d+1$ and $e(k[\Delta]) = e$. In particular, $k[\Delta]$ does not have d -linear resolution.

In fact, put $\mathcal{F} = \binom{[n]}{d} \setminus \binom{[d+1]}{d}$. Let Δ_0 be a simplicial complex on V such that

$$I_{\Delta_0} = (X_1 \cdots X_d X_{d+1})S + (X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_d} : \{i_1, \dots, i_d\} \in \mathcal{F})S.$$

Then $\dim k[\Delta_0] = \text{indeg } k[\Delta_0] = d$, $\text{rt}(k[\Delta_0]) = d+1$, and $e(k[\Delta_0]) = d+1$.

For a given integer e which satisfies above condition, one obtains the required simplicial complex by adding any $(e - d - 1)$ distinct d -subsets of $2^{[n]}$ that is not contained in $\binom{[d+1]}{d}$ to Δ_0 .

Remark 5.5. Now let Δ be a simplicial complex on $V = [n]$. Set $A = k[\Delta]$. Suppose that $\dim A = \text{indeg } A = d \geq 2$. Then one can easily see that $d \leq \text{rt}(A) \leq d+1$; $\text{rt}(A) = d$ (resp. $d+1$) if $1 \leq e(A) \leq d$ (resp. $e(A) = \binom{n}{d}$). So we put

$$f(n, d) = \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} : \begin{array}{l} \text{rt } k[\Delta] = d+1 \text{ for all } (d-1)\text{-dimensional} \\ \text{complexes } \Delta \text{ on } V \text{ with } \text{indeg } k[\Delta] = d \\ \text{and } e(k[\Delta]) \geq m \end{array} \right\}$$

Then $f(n, d) \geq cd + 1$ by Example 5.1. From the definition of $f(n, d)$, one can easily see that there exists a simplicial complex Δ which satisfies $\text{rt}(k[\Delta]) = d$ and $e(k[\Delta]) = e$ for each e with $d+1 \leq e \leq f(n, d) - 1$. On the other hand, by virtue of Example 5.4, one can also find a simplicial complex Δ which satisfies $\text{rt}(k[\Delta]) = d+1$ and $e(k[\Delta]) = e$ for each e with $d+1 \leq e \leq \binom{n}{d} - 1$.

It seems to be difficult to determine $f(n, d)$ in general. Let $T(n, p, k)$ be the so-called Turan number. Then we have

$$f(n, d) = \binom{n}{d} - T(n, d+1, d).$$

In particular, we get

$$(5.1) \quad f(n, 2) = \begin{cases} \frac{n^2}{4} + 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is even;} \\ \frac{n^2-1}{4} + 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

by Turan's theorem (e.g., [2, Theorem 7.1.1]) However, no formula is known for $T(n, 4, 3)$; see [5, pp.1320].

In the rest of this section, we show that the purity of Δ is very strong condition in Theorem 3.3.

Proposition 5.6. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) There exists a d -dimensional Stanley–Reisner ring $k[\Delta]$ such that Δ is pure, $\text{indeg } k[\Delta] = d$ and $e(k[\Delta]) = e \leq 2d - 1$.
- (2) $n = d + 2$, $d \leq 5$ and (d, e) is one of the following pairs:

$$(2, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4), (3, 5), (4, 6), (4, 7), (5, 9).$$

To prove the proposition, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.7. Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a d -dimensional Stanley–Reisner ring which is not a hypersurface. Suppose that Δ is pure and $\text{indeg } A = d \geq 3$. Then there exists a vertex $i \in [n]$ such that $e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{i\}}]) \geq 2$.

Proof. Note that $n \geq d + 2$ by the assumption. Put $e = e(A)$. Suppose that $e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{i\}}]) = 1$ for all i . Then since there exist $(e-1)$ facets containing i for each $i \in [n]$, we have

$$(d+2)(e-1) \leq n(e-1) \leq de;$$

hence $e \leq \frac{d+2}{2}$.

On the other hand, by counting the number of subfacets (i.e., the maximal faces among all faces except facets) of Δ we get

$$de \geq \binom{n}{d-1}$$

since $\text{indeg } A = d$ and Δ is pure. It follows from these inequalities that

$$\frac{d(d+2)}{2} \geq de \geq \binom{n}{d-1} \geq \binom{d+2}{d-1} = \binom{d+2}{3}.$$

Hence $d \leq 2$. This is a contradiction. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5.6. We first show (1) $\implies$ (2). Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a d -dimensional Stanley–Reisner ring for which Δ is pure, $\text{indeg } A = d$, and $e = e(A) \leq 2d - 1$. We may assume that $d \geq 3$. Since Δ is pure, any subfacet is contained in some d -subset of Δ . By counting the number of subfacets that contain n , we obtain that

$$\binom{n-1}{d-2} \leq (e - e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{n\}}]))(d-1) \leq (e-2)(d-1),$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 5.7.

Now let us see that $n = d + 2$. Suppose that $n \geq d + 3$. Then we get

$$\binom{d+2}{4} \leq \binom{n-1}{d-2} \leq (e-2)(d-1) \leq (2d-3)(d-1)$$

by the assumption. This implies that $d \leq 4$.

First we consider the case of $d = 4$. Then $n = d + 3 = 7$, $e = 2d - 1 = 7$. Let $\{F_1, \dots, F_7\}$ be the set of facets of Δ . Since $e(k[\Delta_{V \setminus \{7\}}]) = 2$, we may assume that $7 \in F$ if and only if $1 \leq i \leq 5$. Note that F_i contains only one subfacet that does not contain 7 for each $1 \leq i \leq 5$. On the other hand, one can find at most 4×2 subfacets as faces of F_6 or F_7 . Therefore the total number of subfacets that do not contain 7 is at most 13. However the number of all subfacets which do not contain 7 is $\binom{7-1}{4-1} = 20$ since $\text{indeg } A = 4$. This is a contradiction.

By the similar observation as in the case of $d = 4$, one can prove that the case of $d = 3$ does not occur. Therefore we conclude that $n = d + 2$.

Under the assumption that $n = d + 2$, let us determine (d, e) . Let Δ^* be the Alexander dual of Δ and put $R = k[\Delta^*]$. Then R is a two-dimensional Stanley–Reisner ring with $\text{indeg } R = 2$. Also, $\text{rt}(R) = \text{indeg } R = 2$ since Δ is pure. Thus by virtue of Turan’s theorem (see Eq. 5.1), we have

$$\binom{d+2}{2} - e = e(R) \leq f(d+2, 2) - 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{(d+2)^2}{4} \right\rfloor,$$

where $\lfloor a \rfloor$ denotes the maximum integer that does not exceed a . Namely, we have

$$2d - 1 \geq e \geq \left\lfloor \frac{(d+1)^2}{4} \right\rfloor.$$

It immediately follows from here that (d, e) is one of the pairs listed above.

Conversely, in order to prove (2) $\implies$ (1), it is enough to find (n, e') -graphs (i.e., 1-dimensional simplicial complexes Γ on $[n]$ with e' edges) which does not contain any triangle for each $(n, e') = (4, 4), (4, 3), (5, 6), (5, 5), (6, 9), (6, 8), (7, 12)$. Those complexes will be given in the following example. $\square$

Example 5.8. There exists a 1-dimensional simplicial connected complex Γ on $[n]$ with $e(k[\Gamma]) = e'$ and $\text{rt}(k[\Gamma]) = 2$ for each $(n, e') = (4, 4), (4, 3), (5, 6), (5, 5),$

(6, 9), (6, 8), (7, 12). Put

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{4,4} &= \{[12], [14], [23], [34]\}, \\
S_{4,3} &= \{[12], [23], [34]\}, \\
S_{5,6} &= \{[12], [14], [23], [25], [34], [45]\}, \\
S_{5,5} &= \{[12], [14], [23], [34], [45]\}, \\
S_{6,9} &= \{[14], [15], [16], [24], [25], [26], [34], [35], [36]\}, \\
S_{6,8} &= \{[12], [14], [23], [25], [34], [36], [45], [56]\}, \\
S_{7,12} &= \{[15], [16], [17], [25], [26], [27], [35], [36], [37], [45], [46], [47]\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $[i_1 i_2 \cdots i_p]$ means $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_p\}$.

Let $\Gamma_{n,e'}$ be a simplicial complex spanned by $S_{n,e'}$. Then $k[\Gamma_{n,e'}]$ is a two-dimensional Cohen–Macaulay Stanley–Reisner ring with $e(k[\Gamma]) = e'$ and $\text{rt}(k[\Gamma]) = 2$. Note that when $e' = f(n, 2) - 1$, $\Gamma_{n,e'}$ is the so-called *Turan graph* $T^2(n)$, that is, it is the unique complete bipartite graph on $[n]$ whose two partition sets differ in size by at most 1.

Let $\Delta_{d,e}$ be the Alexander dual complex of $\Gamma_{n,e'}$ where $d = n - 2$ and $e = \binom{d+2}{2} - e'$. Namely, $\Delta_{d,e}$ is the complex spanned by $T_{d,e}$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{2,2} &= \{[13], [24]\}, \\
T_{2,3} &= \{[13], [23], [24]\}, \\
T_{3,4} &= \{[124], [135], [234], [245]\}, \\
T_{3,5} &= \{[124], [134], [135], [234], [245]\}, \\
T_{4,6} &= \{[1234], [2345], [3456], [4561], [5612], [6123]\}, \\
T_{4,7} &= \{[1235], [1246], [1345], [1356], [2345], [2346], [2456]\}, \\
T_{5,9} &= \{[12345], [12346], [12347], [12567], [13567], [14567], [23567], \\
&\quad [24567], [34567]\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $A = k[\Delta_{d,e}]$ is a d -dimensional equidimensional Stanley–Reisner ring with $\text{indeg } A = d$ and $e(A) = e$ for each $(d, e) = (2, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4), (3, 5), (4, 6), (4, 7), (5, 9)$.

Corollary 5.9. *Let $A = k[\Delta]$ be a d -dimensional Buchsbaum Stanley–Reisner ring which is not a hypersurface. Suppose that $\text{indeg } A = d \geq 3$. Then $d = 3$ and Δ is isomorphic to a simplicial complex spanned by $\{[124], [134], [135], [235], [245]\}$.*

Proof. Since A is Buchsbaum and $\text{indeg } A = d$ we have

$$e = e(A) \geq \frac{c+d}{d} \binom{c+d-2}{d-2}$$

by [11, Proposition 2.1]. Also, $n = d + 2$ by Proposition 5.6 since Δ is pure. Thus

$$2d - 1 \geq e \geq \frac{d+2}{d} \binom{d}{d-2} = \frac{(d+2)(d-1)}{2}.$$

This implies that $d \leq 3$, and thus $d = 3$ and $e = 5$. Then one can easily see that Δ is isomorphic to the complex spanned by $\{[124], [134], [135], [235], [245]\}$, which is the Alexander dual complex of a 1-dimensional connected complex spanned by $\{[12], [23], [34], [45]\}$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen–Macaulay Rings*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, Sydney, 1993.
- [2] R. Diestel, *Graph theory*. Second edition Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **173**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [3] J. A. Eagon and V. Reiner, *Resolutions of Stanley–Reisner rings and Alexander duality*, J. Pure and Applied Algebra **130** (1998), 265–275.
- [4] D. Eisenbud and S. Goto, *Linear free resolutions and minimal multiplicity*, J. Algebra **88** (1984), 89–133.
- [5] P. Frankl, *Extremal set systems*, Handbook of combinatorics, Vol. 1, 2, 1293–1329, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.
- [6] L. T. Hoa and C. Miyazaki, *Bounds on Castelnuovo–Mumford regularity for generalized Cohen–Macaulay graded rings*, Math. Ann. **301** (1995), 587–598.
- [7] J. F. P. Hudson, *Piecewise Linear Topology*, University of Chicago Lecture Notes prepared with the assistance of J. L. Shaneson and J. Lees, W.A.Benjamin, Inc., New York–Amsterdam 1969.
- [8] P. Schenzel, *Applications of Koszul homology to numbers of generators and syzygies*, J. Pure and Applied Algebra. **114** (1997), 287–303.
- [9] R. P. Stanley, *Combinatorics and Commutative Algebra, Second Edition*, Birkhaeuser, Boston/Basel/Stuttgart, 1996.
- [10] J. Stückrad and W. Vogel, *Buchsbaum Rings and Applications*, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1986.
- [11] N. Terai and K. Yoshida, *Buchsbaum Stanley–Reisner rings with minimal multiplicity*, (to appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.).
- [12] W. V. Vasconcelos, *Cohomological degrees of graded modules*, in Six Lectures on Commutative Algebra (eds. J.Elias et.al), Birkhäuser, 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF CULTURE AND EDUCATION, SAGA UNIVERSITY,
SAGA 840–8502, JAPAN

E-mail address: terai@cc.saga-u.ac.jp

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, NAGOYA 464–8602, JAPAN

E-mail address: yoshida@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp